



Author's writing and voice

Federico Vida

Received: December 2012 – Accepted: March 2013

Ps. Prof. Professor Facultad de Psicología (U.N.R.).
Journal Director (dixit). Letras, psicoanálisis, arte.
Published in Juan Ritvo & Ricardo Bianchi book, among others, and written in magazines as Nadja & Éxodo,.

✉: federicovida@gmail.com

Who is this in writing? Is the question being asked Barthes from a paragraph of *Sarrasine*, Balzac: (...) Who is speaking thus? The hero of the novel, interested in ignoring the castrato hidden beneath the woman? Does individual Balzac, who has provided personal experience of a philosophy on women? Does the author Balzac, professing certain ideas "literary" about femininity? Does the universal wisdom? Does romantic psychology? (...). The answer offered is that Barthes (...) Never ever be possible to find out, for the simple reason that writing is the destruction of every voice, of every background. (...).

Barthes announces this loss of voice and origin, inherent in writing, as the "death of the author", and pointing with it is to separate the writing life, the biography, the writing of the play, overlapping prebarthesiana literary criticism.

For the French critic said deeds overlapping ideological production is a capitalist structure: the production of the author as "individual" or "individual", in this case "the person of the writer." Barthes cites flipside of this production, and as an alternative, the narrative in ethnographic societies because in them (...), the story has never been in charge of a person, but a mediator, shaman or chanter, which can, in fact, admire the "performance" (ie, mastery of the narrative code), but never the "genius". (...)

Returning to Barthes ethnographic account draws two conclusions, first that the acting, "Performa", is the language, "not a person", the second, the place where they join the multicPLICIDAD of senses and not the author, but the reader, and whose birth is announced by the French critic.

Thus Barthes moves from its original question: the voice (the origin) and writing (or, which is the same, the problem of the author and writer), to the problem of language and reader. With this shift Barthes sets out to destroy the author while edify the reader, which uses structural linguistics: (...), linguistics just provided to the destruction of precious Author an analytical tool by showing that the utterance as a whole is an empty process that works perfectly without having to fill it with people of their partners: (...) .. The definition of enunciation as empty space is something yet does not mean the death of the author, it does not destroy this place, but how empty and empty it from the very person of the writer-if by "person" consistency caused by the biography, but ending on that this article will give another term to countenance.

From the void of enunciation Barthes might have moved towards a differentiation between the author and an empty spot on the writer's biography as filler biographical differentiation redouble their initial act: separate writing life, literature, but no But no sooner had opened the gap between author and writer, the French critic sutured again asserting that (...): linguistically, the author is never anything more than the writer, just as I is nothing but which says I: language knows a 'subject', not a 'person', and this subject, empty except for the very enunciation, which is what defines it, is enough to get the language 'keep up' ie to get completely exhausted. (...)

1636

That is, in the same paragraph, after emptying the author, Barthes again fill to identify the person of the writer, and goes on to point to the empty place is the subject of which, he clarifies, is not a person. That guy (...), empty except for the very enunciation, (...) does not become defined not by Barthes as author or subject-writer, and his conclusion is that that performa, after all, is the language , with which the subject is stripped of act.

This movement that wavers between emptying and refilling, between the opening and closing, it is the problem of registration of the subject in a language structure that does not include it as a positive. But we note that the subject leaves out is the subyectum linguistics, or substantial underlying subject, which, far from being an obstacle to retrieve the subject so unprecedented as did psychoanalysis, was a condition of possibility of recovery, as a is from the vacuum of substance that psychoanalysis may raise the subject as needed. Failure is not yet equal to empty, while psychoanalysis locates the fault (faute) in its connection with the fault (faute) thus opening the question of the subject responsible for the statement, question no means performed structuralism.

Barthes have followed the path that you have opened it to the author as a subject situated in a vacuum, and by means of the difference between subject and person, have distinct and the author of the individual writer, could have continued its inquiry first on the different registers of the voice and writing, respectively addressing them from the author and the writer-clear that this, with the tools of structural linguistics had only led to a binary opposition "subject-person" or "author-writer" to establish a ratio between the void and inexistent enrollment which is not accurate. Barthes's solution to the binary is the use of the neuter, which locates the reader, but stand in the neutral inhibits movement of decision that could interrupt the author-writer pair, that still remains of binary-willing to raise an interrupt between the author and the person, it is necessary to raise the subject responsible for the act by act, as to follow him rehearse, from psychoanalysis.

* * *

In the search for the voice Barthes addresses ethnography, but this reference, take away from the author to make a vacuum in which that voice would reverberate leads him to announce his death. And is that Barthes discusses vacuum from the performative utterance, which leads him to fill the void of the author with writer's ego, "the author is never more than write the same way that the self is none other than the ego that says I ". Recall that Barthes intends to argue that the story is not caused by literary biography, and for that, then make use of the vacuum of enunciation, uses the performative, as in it self and the title would be one of enunciation and the same: that I swear and I swear it says that because the statement refers to the act of stating.

The solution is to replace the original Author Barthes by Reader-I write with a capital for reasons that I shall-forward, while it appears as empty of biography and psychology. But this, again, leaves the problem of the origin and writing offstage. Unless you consider the reader as a writer, but then what would prevent return to this writer that the figure of the author? (Or worse: what kind of writer who would be unable to respond as the author of your writing?).

To specify an answer to this question suggested reviewing the use of the performative Barthes to place the empty statement, and do it from a reference enabling the empty place under the first interest Barthes: writing and voice.

And this because the performative, although the title refers to me, and I of enunciation, but does not refer to the subject of enunciation, while responsible subject of enunciation as defined by Lacan, and this because the act to state goes beyond the intent of the user, to the effects of that statement which I can be subject as I can vouch for these effects-effects that define the very act beyond its intentionality, because, for example, I can swear but I know that means my oath but by its consequences.

This definition of the act from its effects demand response lies in the dimension of the unconscious, the slip being the quintessential example of this say beyond the intent that challenges the subject. Subject is not ego or the self statement of enunciation but the interval that occurs between the time of the interruption of the first by the second. Unlike the statement, which can be written and so take over the title, the subject of enunciation is not that it could fall, but the footprint-or "memory" - an interruption.

It is a mark of the author that is not reducible to the writing of the self (ego statement or enunciation), author of a *stroke* or, to take a more condensed expression, his style as "style" is the utensil with which the inscriptions were made on clay tables -. As in the clay, and even in the ink, the stroke is something that is beyond the letter, but not without it, revealing an inscription then transcends to writing, but from the writing itself.

But, not to postulate a metaphysical stroke is necessary to place it, and it arrived in the company, from psychoanalysis, the initial interest Barthes: locate the voice of the text. And this because psychoanalysis puts the stroke as the registration of the loss of voice, just as the footprint (mnemonic) of that loss (the lost memory). The registration of the stroke, the author's style, is a symbolic inscription impossible to register: the voice, this is what is inscribed in the symbolic as a real impossible to write. In that sense we can distinguish the imprint of the author in writing, of writing itself, which runs on account of the writer. But then it is also now investigating the relationship would be between the writer and the author. For although Barthes accuses capitalist ideology of creating an author as the person of the writer, condescends to identify both when seeking the performative, since when does the author not only empty, but also travels with him to the writer and put in place the reader.

With this shift to the Reader, the problem lies outside of the home, and Barthes problem voice stood at the beginning of his article, and that I have found in an inscription above beyond writing, recording of a loss, origin. But is not the same pose a vacuum source, to raise the enrollment of a vacuum source, and it is the latter that makes no Barthes, making returns in his speech the figure of a writer without loss-ie no-authoring a writer: the Reader. It's because they can not leave the mark of authorship, is the mark of a loss that Barthes raises instead of a DVD Author defined as "the space in which are inscribed without losing all appointments or a lossless". What would a reader writer so defined?, Does a writer without authorship?, Does a modern Commentator, regardless of language, ancient rhetoric posited? -Rhetoric, Barthes has noted (and criticized), is built on the assumption of the externality of the subject to language - the comparison is imposed because "no biography or psychology," as Barthes raises the reader, could only be who were not affected by the language, and also because the role of the commentator is "made to the text to make it intelligible"-these references are "against Barthes Barthes", to emphasize the character that metalinguistic granted by the Reader.

This could not be achieved otherwise than denying the subject matter of the language of the reader, and in fact it is not impossible, I would say more, is a must as metalinguistic requirements of science: achieving a knowledge without a subject, in this case by a deed without a subject to answer for it, which could be reduced to the commentary of the work, the catalog, compiling, etc., we know that nothing is this the position of Barthes as a reader, who is critical as a reader leaves its trace ripping the uniqueness of the work, the author traces the reader makes his writing style.

But it happens that the problem of authorship is not a minor problem because, as Barthes has placed trying to locate a gap in the structure of the utterance: the emptiness of the subject that has no place in the structure, but as something that is account for missing. The risk is to include the subject as a positive, and thus make an ontology language, which is something that it excludes oppositional and diacritically structured as opposed to everything being-in-itself.

That is, the reader can, as in the case of Barthes, becoming author for writing your review, meaning "author" above what I placed in following Barthes, and rectifying its reference to pragmatics by reference the mark on Lacan, footprint loss of voice, the footprint of a knowledge gap in the Other that is a lack of origin. However, the writer is to place it on copyright empty because Barthes had disappeared along with the vacuum to be displaced, in a non-explicit, to the omission of a DVD-pointing displacement, because it omits the return. To do this it is noted that there is no way to put a vacuum (and placed a subject in the vacuum) but by an act, which is the act that just fits that void, and that can only be done by the writer at the time which comes the subject of his writing, that is the moment in which he becomes author.

It is in the act of writing where the writer points out a lack of origin, lack of copyright, should be understood as a failure on the author, a deed for which the author can not answer, and for which the writer responds is that one can only write what is not written on the other (which means we can only write from passing on the other)!. It should be noted here the ambiguity of the word "kick" in French *faute* used by Lacan, which also means "guilt". A fault, which the other can not answer, so load the reader's mind, charging that precipitate anxiety to the point of a work (in this case writing) that allows you to take what that because you need it, that is what guilt that answers your desire. This response is an act of registration of a vacuum (the vacuum author, in this case), which urges the reader to leave the mark of the void, the author traces the writer acts like a face.

Such is the position of the writer: semblance of an author who does not exist, like the voice in the style of the text, that is style mask, and this term would stop because "mask" is one of the etymological meanings of "person", meaning you can give another face to the latter term. The etymology of "person" refers to the Greek theater mask was used to resonate the voice. I take this reference to locate the person of the writer in another record that individuality, mented by Barthes, as the "person" of the writer is projecting a mask authorial voice beyond the text-it is about understanding the person as a *semblance* of being, as Lacan put it, or appearance-of-being, as in homology Blanchot put it, to place the subject, the first, and the language, the second. Prefer cite Blanchot exquisite pen this time: (...) language is undecided between being that he expressed to make it disappear and the appearance of being that he unites in himself to acquire the sense of invisibility and mobility there talkative image . (...). One can only stress that, if there is an ontology language, but an appearance of being, there appears to be the subject for his act.

The writer wears the mask of the author, *semblantea* a gap in the structure, and thus ranks as subject of the act between the vacuum and excess, between author and writer, respectively. In his act is the registration of a lack of subject-author, enrollment for which the writer ranks as the signifier of such failure, and as long as his lieutenant.

After this and not say that the acting is language, but there is a subject responsible for the act: the writer who responds *semblanteando* authorship in his name.

References:

- (1) Barthes, Roland. (1994). *El susurro del lenguaje. Más allá de la palabra y la escritura*. Cap. *La muerte del autor*. Barcelona, Buenos Aires, México, Paidós.
- (2) Barthes, Roland (2009) *La aventura semiológica*. Buenos Aires, Paidós.
- (3) Blanchot, Maurice (2005). *El libro por venir. ¡Hacia donde va la literatura!*. Madrid, Editorial Trotta.
- (4) Lacan, Jacques (2002). *Ciencia y verdad. Escritos 2*. Buenos Aires, Siglo XXI.
- (5) Lacan, Jacques (Inédito). Seminario de 1961-62. Versión de la Escuela Freudiana de Bs. As..
- (6) Lacan, Jacques (1987) *El Seminario, Libro XI. Los cuatro conceptos fundamentales del psicoanálisis*. Buenos Aires, Paidós.